

Species abundances by habitat type (BR = brachystegia woodland, CY = Cynometera, M = Mixed dry tropical forest). Matrix graph shows species observed in matrix directly adjacent to the specified habitat type.





Vertical stacked depiction of the same two graphs above. Essentially community differs between habitat types and matrix



Another depiction of the difference between communities. Which is most effective to you?



You’ve seen this. The species accumulation curves.



Biodiversity metrics from the edge to core for the entire forest combined.



Biodiversity metrics from edge to core for each forest type. Do I need to remove sites with no species from the diversity or richness graphs? I need to check the diversity metric and see if it is “true diversity” or simply the index. Would be useful to see it in “effective number of species”.



**ASF ALL:  
MODEL: ASF all variables\*\*, adjusted R2 = 0.05**

**AXES: (CAP1\*\*)**

**VARIABLES: Small Stem Count (\*), Hab Type (\*\*\*), Basal Area (.)**



**Model: ASF only sig variables (\*\*\*) adjusted R2 = 0.05**

**AXES: (CAP1\*\*\*, CAP2\*)**

**VARIABLE: Hab (\*\*\*), Small Stem (\*)**



No Signal of distance decay in the forest. Not deep enough into the core? (did we just get the edge/matrix specie everywhere we went? Are the spec counts too low? Or is the whole forest lost all the vulnerable species anyway and now its just a wash with the matrix generalists?

These following graphs are different structural habitat metrics from edge to core colored for different habitat types. I think they show that there are non-linear patterns for some of these from edge to core. They differ between habitats. For mixed forest (blue), there appears to be a dip in stem counts and basal area at 30&100m in, but it pulses up at 250m. I think these patterns are indicative of human activity harvesting timber, but can’t say for sure.

